REMARKS

Claims 1-25 were pending for consideration by the Examiner as of the date of mailing of the Office Action. Claims 26-30 are added in this amendment. Accordingly, upon entry of the new claims presented herein, Claims 1-30 will be pending for the Examiner's consideration.

The Office Action rejected each of Claims 1-6, 11-16 and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Serial No. 5,442,633 to Perkins et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Perkins"). All three independent claims (i.e., Claims 1, 11 and 22) were rejected in this manner.

Perkins discloses "a method for routing a packet of information between two hosts that are coupled to a network" (Col. 2, lines 47-49). In Perkins, each of the Mobiles Hosts (MH) 10 and a Base Access Station (BAS) 12 has a unique and independent IP address. For example, Perkins describes that "each MH 10 has a Network Layer Address (IP address or an NSAP)" (Col. 5, lines 18-20). Perkins refers to this address as a " 'permanent address' that does not change" (Col. 5, lines 20-21). Furthermore, "the MH 10 will own but a single IP address" (Col. 5, lines 53-54). A given MH 10 "can ascertain the network layer address of a BAS 12 (or one of the interfaces of the BAS 12) serving the current cell wherein the MH 10 is located, and that a BAS 12 can ascertain network layer addresses of all operational MHs 10 within the cell served by the BAS 12" (Col. 6, lines 17-22). Also, "[t]he IP address of each MH 10 is associated with one of more IP addresses of the BASs 12" (Col. 6, lines 37-38).

In addition, in Perkins, routing is performed by using an LSR option of an internet datagram header (see from Col. 6, line 39 to Col. 7, line 46 and Figures 3A and 3B) and by inserting an address (presumably the IP address) of a destination BAS into a destination address BAS into a destination address of a header (see Col. 8, lines 12-17). Routing in the other

direction is accomplished by inserting the address (presumably also the IP address) into the destination address of the header (see Col. 10, lines 18-23).

Accordingly, if a unique and independent IP address is provided to each MH 10 and BAS 12 and routing is performed by using the LSR option of the internet datagram header and by rewriting the destination address in the header, the amount of information to be included in the header becomes very large, and the routing becomes more complicated.

In contrast, in the present invention of Claim 1, a single IP address includes both a location address and a user identifier. The routing is performed using this IP address. Accordingly, the amount of information to be included in a packet is relatively small as compared to Perkins, and the routing process becomes relatively simplified as compared to Perkins.

Therefore, Perkins does not describe, teach or suggest all of the recited features of Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 is not anticipated (nor for that matter rendered obvious by) Perkins. Note that United States Patent Serial No. 5,442,633 to Voit et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Voit") was used to reject several of the dependent claims, rather that Claim 1. However, Voit does not affect the patentability of Claim 1. Voit relates to the use of a domain-server and likewise does not disclose the concepts in Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 is not rendered obvious over the combination of Perkins and Voit, even if combined. As the combination or Perkins and Voit do not disclose the claimed invention, it is not necessary to address the appropriateness of combining Perkins and Voit. Applicants reserve the right to argue against the combination if the course of prosecution so requires in the future.

Claim 11 and Claim 22 are also distinguishable over Perkins and Voit, either singly or in combination, for at least the reasons provided above for Claim 1. Furthermore, the remaining

rejected claims are dependent from these patentable independent claims. Accordingly, the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons that their corresponding independent claim is patentable.

With regards to the Office Actions reference to Col. 5, lines 7-17 of Perkins, this passage only describes conventional technology in which each IP address is divided into a LAN identifier, and a host identifier. This does not change the fact that Perkins describes a unique and independent IP address being assigned to each Mobile Host and Base Access Station.

For at least these reasons, Claims 1-25 are not unpatentable over Perkins and Voit, either singly or in combination. Accordingly, reconsideration of Claims 1-25 and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections is respectfully requested. Claims 26-30 are new and are also patentable for at least the same reasons as provided herein. Thus, favorable action is requested. In the event that the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 15th day of November, 2002.

Respectfully submitted,

ADRIAN J. LEE
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,785

022913

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

AJL0000000113V001

7   15689.52